Title	*EvalYouth Mentoring Program Evaluation-Final Report*
Timeframe	Rapid, real-time
Duration	August 2021-October 2021
Type	Developmental/Formative
Manager	Maureen Okoli
Contractors	Crosby Consultants & Associates, LLC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

The findings as the result of the rapid assessment and final review of the EvalYouth Global Mentoring Program are presented below.

- ❖ EvalYouth is a widely recognized and respected program for its ability to attract Mentors who are willing to take on the role of technical guidance for Mentees. Similar to other programs, some mentees are interested in just the networking component of the opportunity, whereas others are interested in technical assistance, and so it is possible that "lighter" engagements could be provided for those who do not have the time nor the interest in an in-depth partnership both from the Mentor and Mentee Perspective.
- ❖ A Needs Assessment for Employers, would assist EvalYouth with understanding the needs of the community at large. Further, this would increase engagement with Employers for future program scaling. A suggested approach is provided in the Tool Kit.
- ❖ Mentees tended to pick and choose the materials that were relevant to their current job or project, which is in line with Adult Learning Principles in general. Mentees could not recall much about the modules, including basic M&E principles nor Evaluation Thinking, which is a normal result of formal, self-directed training. A learning needs assessment would need to take a diagnostic of the learner's current level, including subject matter quizzes, prior to the start of the training/module, and concluded with a summative test.
- ❖ Satisfaction for phase I participants was low, indicated by the average overall satisfaction score of 2.6 but also a high dropout rate. Phase II overall satisfaction was increased to 3.1, which is an achievement, even if the cohort size was larger. The drop-out rate also improved from around 30% to around 15%. These could be higher still.
- ❖ It is observed that there might be a mis-match between the aims of the modules and the learning content. For one, the objectives in the modules are the lowest level in Bloom's taxonomy, which is suitable for formal learning programs, but are not suitable for higher-level objectives found in the self-assessment. The program could consider "learning pathways" as opposed to mandatory modules, since most of the participants have 1-3 years of experience, on average.
- ❖ During the initial engagement with the Mentees and the happy sheets, it is observed that Mentors might need more incentives than Mentees to participate in the program. Some Mentees were not so satisfied with their experience and dropped out because their Mentor was not active. Mentors reflected that networking would be a huge value added for them.

- ❖ Infusion of Evaluation components into the instructional design will both assist with the management and administration of the program, as well as increase desired impact at the learner levels, 1 and 2. Guidance on Assessments is provided within.
- ❖ Development of organizational indicators will also assist with assessing impact at the higher-order levels, 3 and 4, and will necessitate engagement with EvalYouth graduates and employers.
- ❖ The Program should decide what it really wants to offer. That is, whether it should stick with its original design, where experienced professionals sit next to new evaluators in taking them through knowledge and low-order evaluation learning, or build on a program that focuses less on building knowledge, but practicing skills. The former is more conducive for a formal kind of "certification program" the latter is more conducive for a mentoring program.
- ❖ A full evaluation and monitoring plan should be generated; some tools are provided in the Annex.
- ❖ A full community engagement plan should be generated; some tools are provided in the Annex.
- ❖ Direct observation of the training should be done by the next Evaluator through participatory methods.

Context

The purpose of this research is to provide a rapid evaluation of the objects of the EvalYouth Mentoring Program, which include:

- To equip YEEs with the needed knowledge, skills, and capacity for a successful evaluation career;
- To help YEEs formulate an actionable professional development plan with clear steps towards developing those skills;
- To help YEEs identify and overcome challenges, barriers, fears of developing a career in evaluation;
- To aid YEEs in building stronger professional networks towards the advancement of the profession;
- To build linkages with internships and job opportunities in the field; and
- To increase the commitment of evaluation experts who contribute to the evaluation capacity development of YEE.

Approach

A utilization-focused evaluation, as well as formative/developmental and real-time evaluation, is conducted to include a kick-off meeting, readiness assessment, presentation of inception report to the Task Force II leadership, qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis, development of a training evaluation toolkit, indicators refinement, and evaluation framework/plan. The below figure illustrates a summary of the New Work Kirkpatrick levels, and their contents, which indicate "levels of impact." As such, levels of impact are reported at each level and in connection with the process evaluation framework also presented below. Impact will therefore be expressed according to the final summary section.

Level 1: Reaction The degree to which participants find the training favorable, engaging and relevant to their jobs			Level 2: Learning The degree to which participants acquire the intended knowledge, skills, attitude, confidence and commitment based on their participation in the training	Level 3: Behavior The degree to which participants apply what they learned during training when they are back on the job	Level 4: Results The degree to which targeted outcomes occur as a result of the training and the support and accountability package
Customer Satisfaction Measure of only participant satisfaction with the training.	Engagement The degree to which participants are actively involved in and contributing to the learning experience	Relevance The degree to which training participants will have the opportunity to use or apply what they learned in training on the job	Knowledge Skill Attitude Confidence Commitment	Required Drivers Processes and systems that reinforce, encourage and reward performance of critical behaviors on the job	Leading Indicators Short-term observations and measurements suggesting that critical behaviors are on track to create a positive impact on desired results

Source: EvalYouth M&E System Design

Due to the low participation rates of surveys and interviews, as well as the low numbers of participants in the first place, self-selection as opposed to random and stratified sampling. In case there is a historical amount of low participation, then stratified random sampling will only further reduce the pools of individuals, making it more unlikely that an interview will occur. Sensitivity to capturing subgroups, such as beginners vs. advanced, gender diversity, and regional diversity, will be made.

Adapted to EvalYouth's needs and context, we propose a rapid assessment of the current activities. These can form the basis for an improved Macro Learning Framework/Strategy. This is followed by a formative evaluation framework which follows the below sample evaluation framework. We would invite EvalYouth for consideration of a learning framework as inspired by the UNHCR learning policy and the UN Organizational Learning Framework: learning is strategic; learning is effective; learning is accessible; learning is a shared responsibility; learning is part of the culture, and learning is more than training. An additional review of the UN approach to learning and learning coordination recently conducted by the Joint Inspection Office and published in 2020 can also be useful. Specifically, the below process design.

FIGURE: SAMPLE LEARNING PROGRAM DESIGN & DEVELOPMENT PROCESS STRUCTURE

**CROSBY CONSULTANTS &
ASSOCIATES LLC**

Figure 7 – The **10-step process**

Source: United Nations Joint Inspection Unit Report

Upon completion of the micro-level framework, we would finally suggest a mapping to major program outcomes in an Evaluation Matrix similar to the one provided below.

Logic Model

High-Level Impact Modelling

As indicated in the [Theory of Change](#) document found for Phase I, the Taskforce intends on using the Kirkpatrick 4 Levels Training Evaluation model, which measures the impact of the program according to the below model. While this process is useful and recommended, this model alone is not a logic model. Training interventions usually have a simplified logic; where learning gaps or needs are assessed, an intervention is administered, and some change is captured as a result of the training intervention. The method or approach to capturing those changes includes the Kirkpatrick levels, and we also suggest relating this structure to the *New World Kirkpatrick Model*, which focuses on behavioral change[1]. The UNHCR 10-steps incorporates both *process improvements* and *the New World Kirkpatrick Model* for impact analysis at four levels, so that program improvements can be made on an iterative basis.

It is intended that participants gain evaluation knowledge through *changes in skills* and *highly recommend the program to others*--these can serve as the micro-level indicators for the learning framework. In the interim, the daily work should be improved and their networks strengthened. In the long-term, the program should be known for producing and certifying highly competent evaluators globally, which will inform higher level, impact indicators.

Organizational level impact indicators for the Global Mentoring program can be inspired by the [US State Department's MODE framework](#), which endeavors to capture similar indicators related to networking, and overall perception and includes common program aspects of matching participants. EvalYouth could consider adopting these same objectives and indicators if it wants to provide a scalable and highly effective program. For example, below is the evaluation matrix taken from the MODE framework:

---

[1] Gandomkar, R. (2018). Comparing Kirkpatrick's original and new model with CIPP evaluation model. *Journal of Advances in Medical Education & Professionalism*, *6*, 94–95.

	Responsible Entity	Data Source	Reporting
PARTICIPANTS	Award Recipients	Post-Program Survey	Aggregate data for indicators will be reported during required semi-annual reporting
ALUMNI	ECA Evaluation Division	Surveys 1-, 3-, and 5-years after program completion	Aggregate data for indicators will be reported annually
HOST COMMUNITIES	ECA Evaluation Division	Annual Surveys	Aggregate data for indicators will be reported annually
INTERNAL	Award Recipients* or ECA Program Offices	Annual Surveys	Aggregate data for indicators will be reported annually

*Referring to data collection internal to ECA or from the Award Recipients themselves about processes and/or activities.

Networking:

Objective 3: Strengthen engagement among participants, alumni, beneficiaries, and institutions.
Sub-Objective 3.1: Alumni subscribe to platforms for resources and information-sharing.

Additional Recommendations:
Since it is initially observed that there is a mismatch with strategic objectives to lower-level objectives, and objectives can be SMARTer; revisiting the higher-order indicators and objectives is advisable. Below is a filled-in Matrix, which has missing areas that might need development by the program in order to assist with greater impact.

TABLE: MATRIX MAPPING FOR OBJECTIVES TO ACTIVITIES

Primary Goal	Major Objective	Sub Objective	Activities	Modality of Delivery	Indicator	Baseline/Target	Sources
	To equip YEEs with the needed knowledge, skills, and capacity for a successful evaluation career	YEES improve on their job skills by working on real life case studies	Self-Study	Self-directed digital learning	Number of Enrolled		
		YEES engage in six months mentorship program to gain evaluation knowledge and skills	Mentoring	Face-to-Face	Number of Enrolled		
	To help YEEs formulate an actionable professional development plan with clear steps towards developing those skills	YEEs develop a one-year professional action plan at the end of the mentoring program	Self-directed plan writing	Online	Action taken on plan		

		YEEs demonstrate commitment to advance their learning by subscribing to knowledge-sharing platforms	Mentoring	Face-to-face	Action facilitated on plan		
	To help YEEs identify and overcome challenges, barriers, fears of developing a career in evaluation		Self-directed plan writing	Self-assessment	Program satisfaction survey rating on emotions		
			Mentoring		Number of mentor meetings		
	To aid YEEs in building stronger professional networks towards the advancement of the profession		Mentoring	Face-to-face	?		
			Program participation	Online	?		
	To build linkages with internships and job opportunities in the field and		Program participation	Online	?		

	To increase the commitment of evaluation experts who contribute to the evaluation capacity development of YEE.		Mentor volunteering	Online	Number of volunteer mentors		

Key Questions & Answers for Evaluation

Key Questions and Answers	Indicator	Source
Q: To determine how the current mentoring program meets the program evaluation needs of organizations (Non-Profit Organizations, Non-Governmental organizations, Foundations, Private Corporations);	Needs of Other Organizations	Program Organizational Beneficiaries (host institutions)
A: There is a huge need for M&E professionals in every organization because of the Big Data revolution--more data means more evaluation. Even UN agencies are rapidly upskilling and seeking M&E professionals in order to meet the rapidly changing ways of working. It is currently unknown if your program delivers the promise that it makes in terms of meeting needs of other organizations, firstly because specific learning objectives have not been aligned with employer needs.		
Q: To review the outcome and impact of the program on the past cohort of participants;	Participation satisfaction rate, skills change rate, comments	Happy sheets; pre/post skills assessments, Mentor Interviews, Mentee Interviews
A: Daily work was affected by the program for both Mentors and Mentees. This came		

out frequently in interviews.		
Q: To determine program priorities for the future;	Program/Participant Gaps	The outcome of Full Assessment/Evaluation Recommendations
A: See, Recommendations		
Q: Draw on key lessons from the past phases of the mentoring program and provide feasible recommendations to enhance the design and implementation of the next cycle.	Lessons Learned	Interviews with Participants and Leadership
A: Document and data management issues seemed to have arisen with the growth of the program.		*Miro Quick Retrospective from Focus Group*
Q: What was the program's impact on Young and Emerging Evaluators (YEE's)?	Participant satisfaction rate, skills change rate, comments	Happy sheets; pre/post skills assessments, Mentor Interviews, Mentee Interviews
A: Satisfaction rates could be higher. Knowledge retention is poor. Daily work is greatly affected. Employer Needs Analysis should be conducted for a fuller idea of how the community is affected.		
Q: How, if at all, did the program impact (positive or negative /intended or unintended) Mentees?	Comments	Interviews
A: At the behavioral level, Mentees were positively affected, even if magnitude varied amongst participants. Even dropouts utilized the modules.		
Q: What skills and knowledge gained do mentees continue to utilize?	Skills-changes/Comments	Pre/Post Assessment and Interviews
A: A lot of the Mentees commented on the utility of the indicators and framework's aspects of the self-directed online learning. They felt this is what impacted them the		

most, and they continue to use these.		
Q: Has the program added value to the careers of Mentees trained? If yes, to what extent and in what spaces/aspects of their professional development/progression?	Comments	Interviews
A: Mentees commented that what was useful for their career was making a plan and gaining advice about their plans.		
Q: What aspect(s) of the program contributed the most value?	Comments	Interviews
A: Interviewees communicated that having their Mentor help them solve problems contributed the most to their experience. <u>See</u> detailed quotes from the interview findings section.		
Q: To what extent has the program contributed to the evaluation community? ○ How many mentees entered the program with prior evaluation experience?	Prior experience checked	[Applications](#), [Applications](#)
A: According to the applications for phase I, most applicants had between 0-3 years of evaluation experience.		
Q: How many had received training (formal or other) in evaluation prior to the program?	Prior training/experience checked	Interviews
A: All interviewed Mentees had prior experience in evaluation. Most Applicants had prior experience according to their place of work.		
Q: How many Mentees took on, or advanced in, professional roles in which evaluation activities constitute much of the job description? Or changed careers?	Change in position or status	Interviews
A: All Mentees interviewed indicated that their status or position has changed. With some indicating they have gotten more contracts and progressed their careers.		
Q: How aligned is the current mentoring program with the program evaluation needs of organizations (Non-Profit Organizations, Non-Governmental organizations, Foundations, Private Corporations)?	Needs of evaluation organizations	Other Organizations, Bench-Marking

A: Hard to say. No one is capturing these needs at a global level, unless a full Employer Needs Assessment is conducted, we cannot know.		
Q: Are the Mentees successful in their connection to professional networks?	List of Networks	Interviews
Q: Did the program facilitate linkages to professional networks?	List of Networks	Interviews
Q: To what extent are the Mentees inserted in their professional networks?	List of Networks	Interviews
A: One Respondent reflected that she gained access into the Networking community in her region, thanks to her Mentor. However, a full community engagement plan would help with assisting the participants with these kinds of growth areas.		
Q: To what extent is the program aligned with the current professional evaluations' principles and standards	Current professional principles and standards	Evaluator Competencies, Other Organizations
A: I would say the program doesn't align in a professional sense to evaluation standards in the field, based on what I have seen, but most programs don't.		
Q: How does the current program compare and contrast with other evaluation certificates or degree-granting institutions?	Certifications and Training Awards	Other Organizations
A: The comparative advantage of the program is the technical guidance of Mentors at no-cost. Other programs seem to compensate Mentors with either networking or money.		
Q: What would be the most optimum method to screen and match Mentor and Mentee?	Best Practices in Screening and Matching	Other Organizations
A: Dividing the applicants into two categories, those who just want a light connection with two meetings and those who want active guidance with both knowledge AND skills might result in better matched pairs.		

Key Informants & Interviewees

Sampling Frame and Response Rates

Category	Interview Response Rates	Names/Contact Information
EvalYouth Leadership	0/2 (no one responded)	BITAR, Khalil/khalil.bitar.hoc@gmail.com; bianca.montrosse@gmail.com
Task Force II leaders and members	3/7= 43%	https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/fw8w1trfzxvvyp3290zsw/Copy-of-EvalYouth-Task-Force-2-Members-List.xlsx?dl=0&rlkey=5ujwzo7vpl9oinviaro9x4vda
Phase I (2017-18) Mentees	51 (3 invalid emails)	Survey Monkey Dashboard: https://www.surveymonkey.com/stories/SM-25YKWPHJ/
Phase I & II (2018-19) Mentors Focus Group	16/143	Survey Monkey Dashboard: https://www.surveymonkey.com/stories/SM-HHYRCF5J/

Survey Approach- Plan and Results

Participants, including Mentors and Mentees, were invited with SurveyMonkey email collector, which enables timely and automatic follow-up and reminders. Interviews were conducted during the month of September and incorporated into the report ad hoc. Interviews were not recorded and transcripted due to the time-constraints of this evaluation. Incentives were provided to Mentor invitees in the form of an Amazon Coupon code for each

survey participant of around 5.00 USD, up to a total amount of $500.00 USD divided amongst Respondents. Extreme sentiments that were expressed to Crosby Consultants & Associates were forwarded to the MentoringYouth email address, for consideration by management.

Response rates were low for eventual interviews with only 9 interviews being completed. A focus group opportunity was also provided, with no shows for the actual event. Details below.

- ❖ With a survey response rate of 40/170 around 24%, it can indicate that engagement with the program post-graduation, or post interaction is probably low. That said, the benchmark for online surveys is 30% in the first place, so the achieved results are reasonable.
- ❖ Mentees were quite difficult to speak with. Several did not show up for their scheduled interview (around 7) and one person rescheduled at least three times, not having an interview in the end.
- ❖ It was observed universally that mentees did not retain a great deal of knowledge after their experience, which is normal for training and learning programs. Unfortunately, none of the Interviewees could recall any principles of M&E nor Evaluation Thinking.
- ❖ The value of the program to most individuals was the relationship with their Mentor, which in most cases did not meet their full expectations according to the Respondents interviewed.
- ❖ Relating to Program impact, meaning the effect of the program on the daily work of participants the following quotes are notable:

In general, it gave me more confidence in what I was doing. I was learning by doing, and feeling a bit lost, and relying on my common sense and it was great to see that what I am doing is actually what people around the world are doing. I feel less panicked. And of course, and the difference between program progress indicators and how they relate together seems silly but we needed to see how they could connect.

It is hard to tell, because I didn't get the full support from EvalYouth, but it didn't stop me from doing evaluation. On the job is where I learned about evaluation. If I had a Mentor, maybe I could have improved more or approached different projects. I entered too early. I had a year's worth of experience when I started. Still learning different approaches.

The training helped me a lot because it helped me when it comes to indicators and I am now more proficient when coming up with indicators in designing a program. I am often asked to design the M&E framework.

I had written down wanting to understand how to think about what methodology should be applied and in what context, I don't feel like I came away with a lot of clarity on that. My Mentor said that this simply takes more exposure to evaluation. Reading a lot of evaluations.

The program had a positive impact on my prospective for growth. What I put in my plan, I set out to pursue, I did complete quite a number of them.

Mentor Focus Group- Results

The Mentor focus group was quite useful to the participants as they enjoyed socializing and share their reflections with their peers.

Mentors noted that they would have liked both support from EvalYouth as well as the opportunity to ask one another about their challenges associated with Mentoring. Despite this, they felt the program affected the daily work of both their Mentee and themselves.

My daily work was affected because I was able to see how people respond to issues. I can see that there are certain things I overlooked that need better-detailed attention. One of my Mentees was working at a WB program, and when she required assistance, I used to think certain things were a given. But I realized they aren't and this improved my tolerance level.

Flexibility, being adaptable is required because learners have different expectations and levels of their professional practice. My Mentee was doing a lot of fieldwork. I was able to assist her with Kobo toolbox. When the time came for analysis, we found excel is a good tool, but you have to progress towards more sophisticated software. And she said she cannot get SPSS. My learning has been about sacrifice. She needs to grow into this, and I could spend a few hours going into the details with her. This was really enriching in professional sense and in the grooming.

I am looking at this as more of a sacrifice, and also developing networking between Mentors and Mentees. The time difference is so large that they have to make a sacrifice. But in all the program has identified the fact that there is some level of commitment, but there is a mutual gain. You have the network and the knowledge sharing.

With regards to knowledge and learning the Mentor reflections are supported by the Mentee reflections in the quick knowledge assessment during their interviews.

My Mentee was clear that she doesn't need theory she needs the practice, and what she needs is the skills to do that analysis, and that had been the focus. For me, it has been a broad entry point and within that, we identified individual needs, which were addressed. As I gap, I didn't accompany her to the end of the project to see how it turned out. Otherwise, the knowledge front of the program was more of a guide.

The materials succeed in opening up a discussion, but they did not specifically address the needs of the mentees.

The professional plan was addressing more of the knowledge gaps, and this is how I look at it. We have the specific knowledge gap and then the individual level, upon which this depends.

With regards to Mentor satisfaction, final comments further emphasized the need for Mentors to have opportunities to talk to each other. Mentors also reflected that effects can occur long after the program ends, as was also captured during a conversation with Leadership. The following changes were suggested:

❖ Maybe pre-screening should be categorized both Mentors and Mentees, and better match.
❖ Mentors need a WhatsApp group.
❖ We need to ensure a relationship between the Mentors; we need an alumni system and different selves.
❖ Country-based mentoring programs should be encouraged.

Summary of Program Structure & Design

The EvalYouth program consists of blended learning (self-study and mentoring): Mentor training, self-study with online modules via Moodle, and in-person mentoring consultations. The instructional design is not clear, with specifics, for example how the activities of the learner relate to the Module

objectives. The program is a 6 month long engagement, with starting and ending dates for the program found here. where it is intended that formal learning, as well as informal learning, is combined. The program consists of 6 modules: Why Mentorship?; Principles of M&E; Actors and Opportunities; Skills Development Opportunities; Developing a Professional Action Plan; Future Career. Selection is guided by the following document where a selection of both Mentors and Mentees occurs at the end of Q2. Certificates are awarded according to the below table, found in the 2018 lessons learned document, which it is assumed were also awarded to Phase II:

		Mentor	
		Completed (or Stayed)	**Dropped Out**
	Completed (or Stayed)	Both receive Certificates	No certificate or letter of appreciation to any
Mentee	**Dropped Out**	Letter of Appreciation to mentor alone	No certificate or letter of appreciation to any

Recommendation:

While it is clear the intention for the program was to have Mentor's assist new evaluators with technical aspects of evaluation in a systematic manner, it does not appear that this is how participants are utilizing the program. Management should consider how it wants to continue the design of the program in order to maximize impact in the community.

Program Administration

Guidelines are provided for both the Mentors and the Mentees. Mentor guidelines provide some practical steps the Mentor can take to help the Mentor achieve success according to the modules. The Modules are regulated in a Learning Management System: https://evalyouth.evalpartners.org/login/index.php, which is identified as Moodle and learners are required to use this platform as their primary mechanism for communicating with one another. A Moodle guide has been provided as a video in the Moodle Introduction module. Before every phase, an orientation is provided, including an introduction to Moodle.

Recommendation:
Understanding the journey of the user from its first interaction with the program through his/her engagement throughout and in closing the program should be mapped so that all aspects of the participants are handled with care. Many organizations generate iterative improvements through this mapping exercise, which can be facilitated for the purposes of this Evaluation. The miro tool can be used for this purpose, known as "user experience".

- ❖ A list of individuals receive a call to participate in the program.
- ❖ After selection, Applicants receive an acceptance or rejection letter.

Referring to the learner experience we can consider a ***Mentee life cycle management approach***, which includes the following steps:

1. Community Engagement: Providing multiple avenues for interaction with EvalYouth;
2. Intake of Applications;
3. Selection and Matching;
4. Program Experience;
5. Checking-in;
6. Program Completion;
7. Follow-up and Alumni Engagement

Recommendations:

Some small interventions could be made at critical aspects of the above program engagement cycle in order to increase both Mentor and Mentee satisfaction, such as creating group meetings instead of one-on-one meetings and provide feedback opportunities after each meeting. Further, a community engagement plan should be generated in order to increase impact after the program is finished.

Evaluation Aspects of the Instructional Design

The evaluation components of the training program consist of a [Pre/Post assessment](#), satisfaction questionnaires (happy sheets), and interviews with participants in 360--meaning their Mentors are also interviewed. According to the Pre-post assessment questionnaire, several skills and competencies are identified that the learner should have changed based on both their interaction with the material and with their Mentor. As mentioned above, it is already observed that there is a mis-match between what is achievable with blended learning formally and what is achievable with in-person skills practice with feedback. Normally, lower-level Blooms are assigned to formal learning, i.e. reading and self-studies and skills development happen with practice and feedback.

According to a review of the materials found in the modules, the following observations are made:

1) There is a mismatch between the Pre/Post assessment knowledge and skills and the online modules currently. Missing learning objectives at the beginning of each module.
2) Skills building is not conducive to self-directed digital learning alone. For example, few of these are achievable with the current online self-directed format and in current quality:
   - ❖ Have a thorough understanding of the practical cases they are working on and how they can add value through evaluation practice.
   - ❖ Understand the principles of human centered design thinking, M&E, and recognize practical capacity requirements. Be able to explain the role and value of evaluations.
   - ❖ Know how they can improve their own existing (or former) evaluations based on an increased knowledge of how to practically apply their understanding.
   - ❖ Build a deep understanding of their current skill set in evaluation and identify their desired one.
   - ❖ For advanced Mentees: Identify clear steps towards improving current of future practical work in evaluation techniques.

➢ Activities within the modules are underdeveloped in the current online modules. Much more can be done with other online platforms like Articulate Rise.
➢ A project-based exercise/internship experience or assisting the Mentor with his/her work might serve to replace these modules as the program is attracting those with 1-3 years of experience.
➢ Neither formative nor summative assessments are found.

Recommendations:

1. Improve Learning Needs Assessment processes and procedures and align them with Employer needs.
    -Source learning objectives from LNAs at the individual level for individualized "learning pathways".
2. Keep learning objectives for self-directed digital learning to low order Bloom's and remove skills objectives.
3. Make objectives SMARTer.
4. Further develop modules. Suggest: Articulate RISE software.
5. Further develop design documents before the module development stage.
6. Incorporate assessments standards: 3 attempts, at 80%; summative tests at the end of modules, with single answer multiple choice. Within module formative assessments can include T/F and matching.

Benchmarking- Plan, and Results

In-depth calls we had with Washington Evaluator's Associate and UCLA Mentoring Program.

Interview with Beeta, President of Washington Evaluators: https://washingtonevaluators.org/Mentor-Minutes.
The main take-aways of the interview were that the mentoring program is part of a larger strategy for "community engagement", which includes Evaluators Without Borders, that match employers with Evaluators who are able to perform evaluations for free or at low cost. Members have a varied level of

engagement, but no recognition programs. No formal algorithm for matching is applied because the interaction is light, only asking for two conversations. Very few are able to do in-depth technical mentoring and it is much harder to ask Mentors to commit deeply at the technical level. As such, EvalYouth garners a huge amount of respect in the community for recruiting Mentors who are willing to mentor new Evaluators at no cost, at the technical level.

The SRM Undergraduate Mentor Program at UCLA is 10-week Program where in-depth technical mentoring was a huge success. A light level of thought including benchmarking other programs and careful selection criteria contributed to the success, but also a focus on the socioemotional aspects and creating that connection.

Students were already taking methodology classes. Professors were asked to make referrals. Mentors receive a call, and grad students volunteer. A community that people were already a part of. What Mentors got out of it was the community amongst themselves, and especially during Zoom time. People felt it was a privilege to be part of the community. "I looked forward to this every week". Each Mentor got a stipend of 1500 USD. Public praise at the department level. Mentors were also asked to participate in training. There was a weekly group meeting, but there were two different groups twice per week. Each session had a feedback form after the session. Topics were organically addressed, and were adapted each week based on this feedback. See the reference list in the appendix.

Conclusion and Summary

The impact of Phase I and Phase II of the EvalYouth mentoring program can be described in three levels, according to the New World Kirkpatrick framework outlined in the approach. Impact is contributed to at several levels, the first being primarily satisfaction oriented: participant satisfaction with the training; engagement with the training, and the degree to which it is relevant to their daily work. Knowledge, skills, and attitudes are also contributions to the impact of the program, which include for EvalYouth's purposes, knowledge at the module levels. Performance as Evaluators is captured by the improvement of their Evaluation performance after having taken the training, and finally, the organizational goals, and how they are met by the program in the context of the Evaluation Community as a whole.

High-quality evaluations were performed for Phases I and II, which emphasized participant satisfaction. Participant satisfaction has improved but still has some areas for growth. The Management in these phases took great care in correcting and improving the program according to these evaluations. When the program worked, it worked very well, which a huge amount of satisfaction was experienced by most participants. However, in some cases, these pairings

didn't work very well, which could likely pull down the average in ratings. In case these outliers would be removed, a high degree of impact can be found at this level.

Level two contributions to impact, which related to knowledge, skills, and attitudes were difficult to attribute to the program in the first place, as most Respondents could not recall content related to the modules. In case the organization wants to continue to devote resources to the Module development, it should assess whether it is cost-effective compared to securing a seat for EvalYouth participants in other programs, similar to the Washington Evaluators Association.

The highest impact can be noted at level three, behavioral change levels, as both Mentors and Mentees explained how the program affected their daily work. Further, these daily effects continued after the training due to the continued relationships that they maintained with each other and the contacts of the program. When the pairing was successful, daily work was affected and continues today.

Organizational impact, level 4, or broader community impact was limited in data as several of the indicators were missing from the Organization's evaluation framework. An Employer Needs Assessment was drafted but it proved necessary to postpone such a large survey to the data collection at Phase IV, where the Organization could take more time in performing a full needs analysis at the community level. However, the benchmarking process provided initial information about the very high reputation of the program, as well as the very special in-depth technical assistance provided by the Mentors themselves.

Annex

Readiness Assessment- Results

Key Questions According to the 10-Steps Framework

1. Were learners selected based on gaps analysis of skills?
   a. According to whom and why?

According to the design which was presented in the documents, learners were selected using a criterion, but skills analysis was not performed prior to selection, only after.

2. Is the approach to learning correct? Is mentoring the best way to approach the problem? What other factors contribute to the problem that needs to be solved?

It is not clear from the documentation what gap the program tries to fill aside from increasing capacity and opportunities for new and emerging evaluators globally.

3. Are the learning objectives SMARTer
   a. Are they constructed with stakeholder buy-in?
   b. Is evaluation infused in the training modules themselves?

See, rapid analysis.

4. Is the material developed in line with basic instructional design principles of Adult Learning?
   a. If there are assessments, do they meet basic assessment criteria?
5. How well is the program administered?
   a. Are problems addressed in a timely manner?
   b. Are events organized properly?
   c. Is adequate support provided to both the Mentor and Mentee?
   d. Is the learning system efficient?
6. Is there an evaluation framework?
   a. Are there multiple levels of evaluation and are sources triangulated?
   b. Are findings and lessons learned taken into account in the next iterations of the program?

❖ Is the mentoring strategic?

The EvalYouth program appears to take monitoring and assessment seriously, with a huge amount of care towards the assessment and organization of the program. There might be some misalignment of learning module objectives to overall program objectives, as well as a need to make both high-level objectives and learning objectives embedded in the modules, SMARTer.

❖ Are mentoring needs assessed?

A pre-post assessment was provided to Phase I mentees. Data are lost for pre/post-training self-assessments Phase II, which signals an area for improvement.

❖ Is mentoring tracked and monitored on a quarterly and yearly basis?

The mentoring was tracked in Phase II as the result of the Lessons Learned Document, which emphasized the need for adequate administration and sensitivity to program administration. Mismatching and Mentorship failures could be taken to zero, so that satisfaction is 100%. This would be a good target for the Organization.

❖ Is data management robust? Who is responsible?

The Administrative Assistant hired for the role in Phase II took responsibility for data collection and other follow-up tasks. The data are collected in an Excel file. Better utilization of the Excel file might be achieved if Mentors and Mentees are kept in separate tabs. This will enable the use of Pivot tables and other features of . Also, the dropout page is missing names in the tab called "Drop Outs" (Was resolved after readiness assessment). Coding the levels with numbers instead of words will also make the sorting function easier. I would suggest using software to manage this program. Survey Monkey is a fantastic tool where automatic reminders can be scheduled and data are automatically analyzed in dashboards. Data will not be lost.

❖ Is mentoring effective?

As I see, effectiveness has been measured based on qualitative feedback, in a 360 approach, which is useful. There might be a need to strengthen the assessment using objective indicators and to broaden the capturing of impact by incorporating feedback from the employers of graduates.

❖ Is the evidence of impact on organizational performance?

I have not seen high-level organizational indicators; while aims are present, metrics can be developed.

❖ Is there a monitoring and evaluation framework?

The framework used by the last Evaluator was the 3e's. It is useful but could be strengthened with a New World Kirkpatrick's, like the ten-steps, which incorporates both what is happening impact-wise and how activities are affecting that impact. Baseline assessment data must be taken and reviewed with the Mentor at the start of the program. In this case, Survey Monkey would be used. Again, it is also a good way to track and respond to program problems, decreasing the dropout rate.

❖ Is M&E incorporated into the design of mentoring programs?

I did not observe that evaluation is embedded in all aspects of the mentoring program. Formative and summative assessments should be designed and embedded into the modules.

❖ Does the framework go beyond basic training satisfaction feedback or level 1 questions?

360 style interviews are good, and could be accompanied by objective indicators.

❖ If so, is there an objective, and reliable review outside of 360 qualitative interviews?

Not clear.

❖ Is learning content SMART (specific, measurable, accessible, relevant, and timely)

Learning objectives should be lowered to the basic Bloom's level and made more specific. Tailoring to the Mentee would also be something for later program development.

❖ Are there high utilization rates of the available offerings?

The dropout rate for Phase I did appear quite high. Dropout data are not available for Phase II, (resolved after readiness assessment) but this will be attempted through survey capture.

❖ What are the initial reactions at level 1?

Satisfaction for participants was low, indicated by the average of 2.6 but also the high dropout rate. Phase II overall satisfaction was increased to 3.84, which is a huge achievement. We are not sure if the dropout aspect improved in Phase II since dropouts are missing.

- ❖ Is mentoring accessible?

The Task Force did a good job in making sure this was accessible to as many diverse regions as possible.

- ❖ How are people selected?

The selection was addressed and improved based on the Phase I evaluation.

- ❖ Is a mentoring culture encouraged?

One way to encourage mentoring culture is to ask Mentees if they would like to become a Mentor.

Focus Group and Leadership Invitation Letters
Leadership

Dear Task Force II Leadership,

We are writing to cordially invite you for a 30-minute focus group opportunity on **28 September 2021 at 1PM GMT/ 3PM CET** regarding the EvalYouth Mentoring Program Phases I and II.

Primarily we are interested in your perception of how things worked or didn't work during the program, as well as any other important issues you would like to discuss.

Please respond directly to this email. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Kindly, Michelle O. Crosby

Mentee

Surveylink: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/MenteeEvalYouth

Initial Results

Live Dashboard: https://www.surveymonkey.com/stories/SM-25YKWPHJ/

Letters to Participants

Dear [FirstName],

We are writing to cordially invite you for a 15-minute interview opportunity this month (September) regarding the *EvalYouth Mentoring Program* you participated in. Crosby Consultants & Associates, LLC has been contracted by the EvalYouth Task Force to conduct a developmental, rapid evaluation of the program and its mentoring activities for both Phase I and Phase II. EvalYouth strives to make your experience as valuable as possible and so your feedback would be greatly appreciated. All interviews will be conducted confidentially and no information will be individually identifiable.

The interview will cover the following topics broadly:

1. What do you recall about your mentoring program. Does something stick out for you in particular?
   - What are some principles of M&E and evaluation thinking can you recall?

   - What is the role of evaluation?

2. To what extent was your daily work affected by what you experienced in the program? Can you provide any examples?

3. What areas of knowledge were expanded for you? What areas do you feel the program could have assisted you with more?

4. How well did the program help you identify sectors and opportunities for working in evaluation?

5. What kinds of skills do you feel you have now, that you didn't have before the program?

6. Any additional comments or questions?

Please feel free to reach out to me with any further inquiries: michelleo.crosby@gmail.com.

Kindly, Michelle O. Crosby

Mentors

Live Dashboard: https://www.surveymonkey.com/stories/SM-HHYRCF5J/

Dear ABIGAIL,

We are writing to cordially invite you for a 1-hour focus group opportunity on **07 October** 2021 at 10AM CET regarding the EvalYouth Mentoring Program you participated in as a Mentor. Crosby Consultants & Associates, LLC has been contracted by the EvalYouth Task Force to conduct a developmental, rapid evaluation of the program and its mentoring activities for both Phase I and Phase II. EvalYouth strives to make your experience as a Mentor as valuable as possible and so your feedback would be greatly appreciated. The focus group will be conducted confidentially and no information will be individually identifiable.

*An Amazon coupon will be provided to all Respondents.

The interview will cover the following topics broadly:

1. What do you recall about your mentoring experience? Does something stick out for you in particular?

2. To what extent do you feel the daily work of your Mentees was affected by what they experienced in the program? Can you provide any examples?

3. What areas of knowledge were expanded for your Mentees? What areas do you feel the program could have assisted with more?

4. How well did the program help you identify sectors and opportunities for working in evaluation for your Mentees?

5. What kinds of skills do you feel your Mentees have now, that they didn't have before the program?

6. Any additional comments or questions?

Please feel free to reach out to me with any further inquiries: michelleo.crosby@gmail.com.

Tool Kit

Consideration for Program Design

Learning Formats

Digital	▪ Self-paced learning (online, audio, video, knowledge objects)
Forum	▪ In-person classroom training ▪ Virtual classroom training ▪ Experiential learning/ action learning ▪ Go-see-visits ▪ Inspiration events
Field work	▪ On the job training/ breakthrough projects[1] ▪ Job rotation
Coaching	▪ One-on-one coaching and feedback (incl. peer-to-peer) ▪ Group coaching

McKinsey & Company, IFAD Skills Gap Report

Sample Learning Needs Assessment- Basics

The below guidance can be adapted to a survey for Employers and/or utilized for assessment of learning needs of Participants.

01- Demographics

Basic gender, language, disability status, age, rank, position/title, and region should be collected for each target group. Target group selection should have the basic requirement that they currently work in the area where the training will be applied or they will work in the area where the training will be applied after the training completion, otherwise the training will not be effective. A question about their current position should be included as a demographic.

These are standard questions for general demographics but should be harmonized with the regional coverage of the training.

02- Knowledge Quiz

Self-Directed Learning has some limitations, especially when it comes to our expectations about behavioral change. This handout explains why, and provides some examples of single-answer multiple-choice questions.

A single answer multiple-choice, summative design should be installed at the beginning of the survey, or in the method of choice, in order to obtain an *objective* sense of the individual's knowledge in the area. Subject Matter Experts should provide the content for the questions, but do not necessarily have to design the questions. Quality control of the questions should be handled by an assessment/evaluation expert.

These generally utilize a quiz function in a survey.

03- Self-Ratings

A self-rating of pre-determined skills and competencies should be provided in the LNA. The skills and competencies should be determined by the Subject Matter Expert and harmonized with skills gap areas, the individual learning pathways, the job profile descriptions, and the performance standards of the individuals who are the target audience and their employers.

These are generally a rating matrix in a survey.

04- Topical Preferences

Topical preferences should be added by the subject matter expert. Respondents will rate these in terms of topics that they would like to see covered.

These questions are generally a rating matrix in a survey.

05- Enablers and Barriers

Enablers and Barriers to performing their daily work should be queried in the survey, and prompts shall be provided such as time constraints and learning modalities.

These are generally open-ended questions.

M&E Framework- Sample

Kirkpatrick Level	Type of Change Per Cohort Per Training	INDICATOR	DEFINITION How is it calculated?	BASELINE What is the current value?	TARGET What is the target value?	DATA SOURCE How will it be measured?	FREQUENCY How often will it be measured?	RESPONSIBLE Who will measure it?	REPORTING Where will it be reported?
1	**Training Satisfaction**	Summary of Training Ratings	Standardized Training Questionnaire Course Referral Rate			Self-Assessments	Post-Training		
2	**Change in Knowledge/ Skills**	Self-Ratings on Course-Based Learning Objectives formulated on Needs Assessment	Learning Objectives are formulated based on the Needs Assessment. A rating is provided as a part of the Training Questionnaire.	Y/N	? Increase in self-perceived skills	Self-Assessments	Post-Training		

2	Change in Knowledge/ Skills	Tests/Assessments Scores	Scores for Summative Tests are Based on the Participants abilities.	?	70% Passage rate		End of Module and Final Test		

2	Change in Knowledge/ Skills	Other assessments as part of the Learning Program	Depends on the type of assessment			Depends on Type of Assessment	End of Module/Course		
3	Change in Behaviour	Supervisor notices changes in daily work	Interviews			Supervisor Interviews about on-the-job observations	3-6 months after training		
3	Change in Behaviour	Participant notices changes in daily work	Interviews			Participant Interviews	3-6 months after training		

3	**Change in Behaviour**	Both Participants and Supervisors record changes in daily work	Documentation			Performance Matrix	Annual	
4	**Organizational Change**	Organization reaches objectives				KPI's Benchmarking	Annual	

Suggested Data Collection Plan

	WHAT TO COLLECT	DELIVERY MODE	TIMEFRAME	SENDER	RECEPIENT	REPORT TO
Mentee Feedback						
	Mentee Feedback Happy Sheet	Survey tool	After Placement to Mentor	EvalYouth	Mentee	EvalYouth Management
	Mentee Feedback Happy Sheet	Survey tool	Mid-Program and end of year 1 and 3	EvalYouth	Mentee	EvalYouth
	Mentee Feedback Exit Interview	Interview Questions by EvalYouth Management	At the end of 6 months	EvalYouth	Mentee	EvalYouth

	WHAT TO COLLECT	DELIVERY MODE	TIMEFRAME	SENDER	RECEPIENT	REPORT TO
Mentor Feedback						
	Mentor Feedback Happy Sheet	Survey tool	After Placement	EvalYouth	Mentor	EvalYouth Management
	Mentor Feedback Happy Sheet	Survey tool	Mid-Program and end of year 1 and 3	EvalYouth	Mentor	EvalYouth
	Mentor Feedback Exit Interview	Interview Questions by EvalYouth Management	At the end of 6 months	EvalYouth	Mentor	EvalYouth

Employer Feedback						
Employer Needs Analysis	Survey tool	Before Program Start		EvalYouth	Employers	EvalYouth Management
Employer Feedback Happy Sheet	Survey tool	End of year 1 and 3		EvalYouth	Employers	EvalYouth

Possible Alumni Engagement Objectives, Activities and Metrics

Alumni (Mentors and Mentees) Engagement Activities and Benchmarks		
Increased access - Continued engagement with alumni community	Survey Questionnaire	Once per year
Increased access - Events (networking, mentoring, panels, etc.)	Post-Event Survey	After every event
Increased digital automation - Survey Monkey?	Lessons Learned	Once per year
Increased digital transformation - Webinars, or other online social platforms	Lessons Learned	Once per year

	Increased financial sustainability - Advertising of alumni satisfaction in public forums, with testimonials, and increased engagement with Strategic Partners	Lessons Learned	Once per year
	Increased financial sustainability - New donors	Lessons Learned	Once per year
	Increased visibility - Social Media Branding	Pre-Post Social Media Metrics; Lessons Learned	Once per year

Design ToolKit

Following the above approach to training evaluation generally, we would recommend an infusion of evaluation into the instructional design itself. Below is a sample matrix used for mapping purposes of the program's modules. Additionally, we would propose a mapping of the User Experience using this tool Miro: a sample can be found [here](#). Any objectives must be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Timely).

TABLE: SAMPLE MAPPING MATRIX FOR A SINGLE LEARNING INTERVENTION

Topic/Session	Main Objective	Sub Objectives	Activities	Sources	Assessment (formative and summative)

References from UCLA Mentoring Program

Hi Michelle (and Maureen)!

It was such a pleasure speaking to you on EvalYouth's mentorship program! Joy and I were so delighted to converse about our experiences in developing the mentorship program.

As promised, please find our reference list as well as the matching surveys in this [Google Drive Folder](#). The links are also below. We also included both mentor and mentee interest forms as well as a brief description of our mission, goals and core pillars. We hope it will be helpful to EvalYouth!

Joy and I reflected after the call on the matching and motivation we discussed, and its connection to the grounded / community-based approach of our program but more importantly, its deep intention.

When working with Dr. Mike Rose, he really emphasized these important points and aspects our program with attention to its focus on social research methodology: (1) it would bring mentors (in our case, graduate students) who have a desire to use their skills and talents to further issues of equity -- "giving back"; (2) our specific knowledge and skills as research methodologists is an area that may be more difficult for lower-income schools and populations to access through -- "equity/access"; (3) our program would create the conditions in which these needs could intersect, thereby having small, focused and intimate spaces that could help keep the program going, while keeping true to the program's core qualities (e.g. network of support, close contact, focus on research methodology, etc.) -- "community".

Hope this all makes sense. Of course, if you have any questions, don't hesitate to reach out to us!

Our best,
Christine with Joy and Mariana

Links:
[Reference Link](#)
[Description of Program](#)
[Interest Survey - Mentor](#)
[Interest Survey - Mentee](#)
[Matching - Mentor](#)
[Matching - Mentee](#)

Documents Reviewed

Phase 1

- 6 learning modules
- Level 2 Pre/Post Assessment
- Lessons Learned (2)
- Program Guidelines (2)
- Level 1 Feedback Survey
- [Survey Questions](#)
- Level 1/2 Meeting Minutes (2)
- Participant Lists/ Number of Participants
- Theory of Change
- External Evaluation Pilot Phase

Phase II

- Lessons Learned
- Mentor Feedback Session
- Mentor Minutes (3)
- [Participants List](#)/[Alternative List](#)
- Level 1 Survey
- Admin Final Report
- Phase II External Review

Weekly Work Plan

EvalYouth Global Mentoring Program

Weekly Timetable

Week 1-2 (Start: August 30)	Week 3-4	Week 5	Week 6 (End: 15 October)

Induction Meeting

Data transfer, analysis, readiness assesment

Stakeholder engagement

Tool kit development

Drafting

Submission and Feedback

Consolidation of comments

Draft Finalization